There are more animals in danger of extinction. Some people say that only the animals

that are useful to humans should be protected. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

**Comment [Dave1]:** repeating yourself – better to write about both sides

Comment [Dave2]: good topic

Comment [Dave3]: never sit in the middle

Task achievement: 6 – developing your ideas, writing 4 paragraphs

Cohesion/Coherence: 6 - 4 paragraphs, more formal linking

Vocabulary: 6 - more academic, no informal language

Grammar: 6 - small mistakes

Overall: 6

Comment [Dave4]:

Intro – paraphrase the topic and give a clear opinion (2 sentences)

 $\underline{\text{https://howtodoielts.com/recent-ielts-writing-topics-2021/}} \text{- study a bit about structure here}$ 

just focus on introductions

look at one topic - write the intro - check with the sample answer

keep repeating

Formatted: Font: Bold

With As natural habitats are being despoiled threatened by human beings, more and

moreincreasing numbers of species are currently facing a higher risk of extinction. The

public tends to hold positive attitudes toward animal protection, yet, some people-claim

that only those useful to humans deserve being protected protection. As far as I'm I am

concerned, all species should be well-protected by usprotected because ... . This view

eld by the minority is both morally and logically improper, and therefore, I totally disagree

with it.

**Comment [Dave5]: increasingly** being threatened

**Comment [Dave6]:** a little weaker – complex, nuanced

**Comment [Dave7]:** instead of the verb phrase – wordy – noun/noun phrase/compound noun

Comment [Dave8]: no contractions

Comment [Dave9]: no us/we

**Comment [Dave10]:** good if you can include your main idea

Comment [Dave11]: never sit in the middle -

Comment [Dave12]: aim for 2 or max 3

sentences for the intro

the reason increasing amounts of species are in danger of extinction, excluding natural evolution, is that human beings are have damageding the environment, causing the loss of numerous habitats as well as the reduction in endangered the natural diet for endanger species animals' foods. For example, in China rapid industrialization over the last several decades required razing forests and building large cities that displaced animals ranging from pandas and pangolins to rhinos and bats. The animal figures for rhinos are especially low as their horns are valued for traditional Chinese medicine. Since these animals flourished for hundreds of thousands of years before humanity, it is logical that humans have a duty to protect the animals they endanger. As those responsible for the situation animals are facing right now, we can not immorally turn our backs on them and leave them to die. Hence, protecting those species are necessary.

Second, how exactly are can proponents of this view going to decide which animals are useful and which are not? Should they consider the amount, the medical usage of the animals or their commercial value? What if the animals turn out to be useful to human a couple few years after extinction, will these people insist on their viewpoint? Without a thorough thinking understanding/accounting of this issue, this idea itself is logically flawed the idea is likely to cause irreparable harm in the long term.

<del>Last but not least</del>, Fi<u>nally, every each i</u>ndividual animal <del>matter i</del>s crucuial in <del>keeping</del>

**Comment [Dave13]:** main idea at the end of the sentence

**Comment [Dave14]:** 10 – 12 words long topic sentence that includes the topic at the beginning

Formatted: Font: Bold

Comment [Dave15]: explain

Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold

**Comment [Dave16]:** really specific – real country/company/person

Comment [Dave17]: real products - specific

Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold

**Comment [Dave18]:** don't run from the example – make it even more specific

**Comment [Dave19]:** aim for these longer (4-6 sentences long paragraphs) with really specific examples

**Comment [Dave20]:** generalize – state the further possible result -

Comment [Dave21]: minimal development

**Comment [Dave22]:** questions are a little too informal

Comment [Dave23]: no idioms

maintaning the balance of mother in nature. If setting those By neglecting less useful useless animals apart from the ecosystem, not only will the food chain be severely impacted, but the biodiversity of the entire system will suffer from huge damage.

Therefore, choosing to protect merely those animals useful to humans is impractical.

In general, if we wish to maintain the balance of in the ecosystem and to live in peace with all creatures on earth, putting every effort into protecting endangered animals is a must, not simply those that serve human ends. Let alone opposing the illogical and morally wrong idea.

task 2 band descriptors - relevant / more and less support

310

Comment [Dave24]: ok

Comment [Dave25]: good start

Comment [Dave26]: pandas

**Comment [Dave27]:** not as much development

Comment [Dave28]: ellipsis

**Comment [Dave29]:** make it 100%, crystal clear

Comment [Dave30]: 250 - 300

Comment [Dave31]: ok